

MILFORD PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING  
July 15, 2014 Board of Selectmen's Meeting Room, 6:30 PM

Present:

**Members:**

Janet Langdell, Chairperson  
Paul Amato  
Kathy Bauer  
Chris Beer  
Steve Duncanson  
Judy Plant  
Tom Sloan  
Susan Robinson, Alternate member

**Staff:**

Jodie Levandowski, Town Planner  
Shirley Wilson, Recording Secretary  
David Bosquet, Videographer

**MINUTES:**

1. Approval of minutes from the 6/17/14 meeting.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

2. **JEG Properties, LLC – Elm St – Map 18, Lot 13:** Public Hearing for a major site plan for a proposed 9,375 SF auto shop with associated site improvements.  
(*New application - Meridian Land Services, Inc.*)
3. **Cynthia & Robert Nute – 9 Powers St – Map 30, Lot 38-1;** Public hearing for a minor site plan for a proposed coffee shop with associated site improvements.  
(*New application*)

**OLD BUSINESS:**

4. **Badger Hill Properties LLC – Timber Ridge Dr – Map 50, Lots 26-124, 26-126, 26-128, 26-129, 26-131, 26-133, 26-160, 26-162, 26-164, 26-166, 26-167, 26-168, 26-169, 26-171, 26-173, 26-175, 26-177, 26-179, 26-180, 26-181, 26-182, and 26-183; Map 51, Lots 26-47, 26-123, 26-125, 26-126, 26-127, 26-152, 26-170, 26-172, 26-174, 26-176, 26-178, and 26-184; Map 55, Lots 26-130, 26-132, 26-134 thru 26-151, 26-153 thru 26-159, 26-161, 26-163 and 26-165.**

Public hearing for a waiver request from Milford Development Regulations, Section 7.02 Roadway Standards Charts and continuation of application for multiple lot line adjustments for Badger Hill-Phase VI involving sixty (60) residential lots and three (3) open space lots; and to approve Phase VI-A for six (6) buildable lots in the Residence R District.

(*Continued from 6/17/14*)

Chairperson Langdell called the meeting to order at 6:30PM. She introduced the Board and staff, then explained the ground rules for the public hearing, and read the agenda into the record. S. Robinson, alternate member was called to sit for T. Sloan.

**MINUTES:**

S. Duncanson made a motion to approve the minutes from the 6/17/14 meeting, as amended from C. Beer's email dated 7/11/14. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**JEG Properties, LLC – Elm St – Map 18, Lot 13:** Public Hearing for a major site plan for a proposed 9,375 SF auto shop with associated site improvements.

*Abutters present:*

*Walter and Rosemary Razzaboni, co-owners of 260 Elm St, LLC*

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Judy Gessner, JEG Properties, LLC

Christopher Desmarais, DTM Autowerks

Kyle Burchard, Meridian Land Services, Inc.

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and stated that the application was complete. C. Beer made a motion to accept the application. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. K. Bauer seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters into the record.

K. Burchard presented plans dated 6/15/14 for the development of an auto shop, DTM Autowerks. We were before the Board in April for conceptual review and in general the layout is substantially the same; however we did pull the building back. There will be one entrance from Elm St. We show twenty (20) parking spaces and the handicapped space will be modified to meet the town's regulations. The 9,375SF building will contain a front office with showroom, a break room and two bathrooms, one for employees and one for customers and have three (3) accesses. There will be a twenty (20') ft aisle around the building to allow for turning movements. The trash dumpster is located at the rear corner of the site and there is a large gravel area for the temporary placement of cars that are being worked on, but there is some confusion regarding the request to screen the area. J. Langdell clarified that the request was to delineate the parking area to prevent creep into the open space. K. Burchard continued saying that the plan is to remove the existing two story house. We received late comments from the Heritage Commission but since we have to file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the EPA for stormwater, we have also submitted application to NH DHR for historical review and they are requiring us to do an architectural inventory of that house. The site is generally flat with a natural ridge in the center which is where the building will sit. The grading follows the natural contours of the property. There are a number of white pines along the frontage that will be removed, but we will try to preserve the existing maples, birches and walnut trees. There are three (3) proposed bio-retention facilities which will contain most of the water from the site. There is a sanitary leach field proposed in front as a lawn area that will be interspersed with trees and low shrubs for the remainder of the landscaping on the site. The water connections from the old house will be used for the new structure and the natural gas will be tapped into from the northwest corner of the building. The lighting, architectural plans and materials, signage and landscaping plans were reviewed in detail. K. Burchard confirmed that all landscaping will be shown and incorporated on the final plans and all staff comments will be addressed.

P. Amato inquired if the building would be sprinkled. J. Levandowski explained that they are not required to sprinkler the building, as it is a steel frame. P. Amato inquired about the awning on the building. K. Burchard replied that the awning will go along the whole Elm St side and part of the way on the east elevation.

J. Plant inquired how close the building would be to the easterly property line. K. Burchard replied approximately ninety-six (96') ft.

J. Levandowski noted that DPW had no comments, per phone conversation today. K. Burchard added that he and Rick Reindeau have had discussion regarding the location and widening of the entrance and there were no issues.

J. Langdell reviewed the staff comments and recommendations from the staff memo dated 7/15/14. K. Burchard said the catch basin was put in from prior approved site work and it was in a convenient location for use in the bio retention facility. The Environmental Coordinator advised that lines tied into the town system are not allowed to be used for such purposes but said it would be acceptable for an overflow event so we will make a small adjustment to only allow for a 50 year storm. We will include the additional plantings on the plan and will coordinate the symbols referenced in recommendation #9. We can put a split rail/post fence to contain and demarcate the parking area and the snow storage in the rear of the property can be relocated.

J. Langdell said that recommendation #5 should be revised to state that police impact fees are applicable and the note be added to the plan prior to signing.

S. Robinson inquired about the Heritage Commission comments. K. Burchard reiterated that the inventory was really a consequence of the amount of site development. One of the EPA requirements is a determination of any historical impact, so we submitted application to the NH DHR. They checked through their records and databases and determined that we had to do an architectural inventory of that house. We are working with DHR through the process to submit the appropriate documentation, materials or photos and have contacted consultants for an RFP to do this investigation. The client did consider incorporating the house into the plan but that presented challenges and they opted not to proceed with preservation of that house at this time. A brief discussion ensued. J. Langdell noted that the Town has some type of historical inventory that may be available and Chuck Worcester of the Heritage Commission might know how to find that resource.

Chairperson Langdell opened the meeting to the public.

W. Razzaboni asked what the days and hours of operation would be. C. Desmarais replied 9-6 Monday through Friday, 10-4 on Saturday and no Sunday hours. W. Razzaboni said he obtained a copy of the first page of the plan that shows only one outside light pole on the east side. Will there be any additional lighting focused towards me? K. Bouchard said the regulations require full cutoff fixtures and the lighting is limited to only minor spill off the property. You will see the light but it will not be aimed at you. W. Razzaboni brought up marking the edge of the gravel for the thirty (30) additional vehicles and said he would hope to see a light duty fence to shield his field of vision from that area. Also, with due respect to the owners, he knows that sometimes 30 cars can lead to 130 cars. J. Langdell referenced the suggestion for the split rail fence to avoid scope creep in that area. She then inquired about the landscaping on the east side of the property. K. Burchard said we will not remove the existing trees and undergrowth in that existing perimeter. W. Razzaboni said he could see the fifteen (15) ft area by the lot line on the plan; will plowed snow creep into that area? P. Amato referenced the landscaping plan and said the intent is to leave the existing vegetation as a natural barrier. K. Burchard added that the bio-retention basin is a bit oversized and can be pulled in to make it more uniform along the fifteen (15') ft setback all the way down. The boundary line has been surveyed and is of record. W. Razzaboni stated that my wife and I live there several months out of the year and it's a combination of residential and commercial uses. The brush is not very substantial and there are no evergreen trees so come the fall, everything will be gone. He would like the Board to entertain adding some fencing maybe 100' along the middle third of that 267' line to protect my view.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

J. Langdell read email correspondence dated 7/8/14 from Randy Snyder of Trelleborg Pipe Seals Milford regarding connecting to the Milford sewer system. P. Amato asked if abutters wanted to get together with the Water and Sewer Commission to extend sewer along there, would you be opposed to contributing to that instead of spending X amount of dollars to install a septic system. K. Burchard said the timeline is what is important; the goal of this development is to be in the space by winter. I don't know what the timeline would be for design, review, approval and construction to bring the service in. There was a previous design from Meridian but he was not sure where it went in the process and what would even be possible. We understand the desire to seize upon the opportunity, but are there enough other neighbors willing and ready to contribute to such a public improvement and we don't want to jeopardize our timeline. A brief discussion ensued. J. Langdell said we will certainly forward this to the Water/Sewer Commission but it doesn't affect this proposal.

P. Amato made a motion to approve this application with staff recommendations, and that the bio-retention area be pulled in, that the gravel area be delineated, that all proposed landscaping be shown on the plan and recommendation #5 be revised as stated. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor.

J. Langdell added that street numbering should be added to the proposed signage.

T. Sloan stepped up to the Board, excusing S. Robinson.

**Cynthia & Robert Nute – 9 Powers St – Map 30, Lot 38-1;** Public hearing for a minor site plan for a proposed coffee shop with associated site improvements.

*Abutters present:*

*Judy Cole-Bower*

*Charles & Ruth Patterson, New Westerly Properties, LLC*

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Robert & Cynthia Nute, owners

Peter Nute

J. Langdell read the notice into the record and stated that the application was complete. S. Duncanson made a motion to accept the application. C. Beer seconded and all in favor. C. Beer made a motion that this application did not pose potential regional impact. S. Duncanson seconded and all in favor. S. Wilson read the abutters into the record.

R. Nute presented plans dated 6/20/14 and explained the proposal for the small coffee shop. There are five parking spaces and one handicapped space. The service will mainly be come in, get a coffee or espresso and take out, but the building may have up to twelve (12) seats. Regulations require one (1) parking space for every three (3) seats. We're trying to leave the front of the building intact; the existing grass has a nice appearance and putting the parking in the rear will have the least impact, all in all. The property has been surveyed and we are in the process of putting in a split rail fence along the back so the parking wouldn't creep over.

J. Langdell inquired about the seasonal parking; spaces 7 and 8. P. Nute said that's an area at the edge of the pavement and there is an assumption that people will tend to park there, regardless whether it is marked off or not and the seasonal aspect speaks to the fact that snow in winter will certainly impede people from parking there. J. Langdell inquired about the property line. P. Nute explained the property lines on the plan and noted that the white outline of the picture in the Board's packet is incorrect. The split rail fence will go along the property boundary.

K. Bauer inquired about staff comment #11. R. Nute said we would like to revise the parking to meet the required 24ft dimensions and we can put parking space #1 by the building. We have more than enough open space and will revise the calculations.

P. Amato asked about the entrance. R. Nute said the proposed entrance will be from the back of the building. It is low to the ground so we will have a single step up and can put in a ramp for handicap accessibility.

K. Bauer noted that the ZBA granted a variance for this commercial use in an industrial zone. J. Langdell asked for clarification of the date of that decision as the staff memo and plan are different.

Chairperson Langdell opened the meeting to the public.

C. Patterson said his property was directly behind and adjacent to the parking area. Is there any type of setback requirement for the parking as it is right on the property line? If I had my druthers, I would prefer to see the parking on the front side, but do understand that there may be issues in regards to that. At the very least, I would like to see some delineation of the driveway coming in off Longley Pl instead of just a wide open parking area. Currently that whole area is mostly lawn with small asphalt pad. J. Levandowski confirmed there is no parking setback, it is not considered a structure and a buffer zone is only required if the property abuts a residential use.

C. Patterson inquired about the days and hours of operation and the proposed lighting. R. Nute said our intention is to be open from 6:00AM to 2:00PM, Tuesday through Saturday. We haven't thought through the lighting yet, but we will comply with all regulations. C. Patterson reiterated that he feels the proposed parking will directly impact his property and operations and would like to see it moved to the front. P. Amato said the proposed fence is a good idea to help delineate the property line. C. Beer said it would be good to show where the pavement will join with Longley Pl. J. Langdell suggested delineating the curb cut on the plan and showing a barrier for parking space #2 using an asphalt berm, curbing or wrapping the split rail fence. C. Patterson gave a brief history of the jog in the land and said he would be amenable to working with the Nute's to try and square off the lot lines. R. Nute further explained the existing site conditions and paved areas and noted that we are not delineated by the stonewall shown by the railroad.

J. Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

J. Langdell read the staff comments and recommendations from the memo dated 7/15/14. J. Langdell asked if the tree shown in seasonal space #7 was staying. R. Nute said he hopes to not take it down but will measure where the actual trunk is to make that determination. J. Langdell noted that if that tree would come down for the parking, we would expect that you would plant a tree somewhere else on the property to meet the landscaping regulations. R. Nute said we want to keep the existing greenery and landscaping. J. Langdell said that there should be a note on the plan referencing the seating because that is what defines the parking requirements and also the parking calculations should be added. R. Nute stated that the intention is to reconfigure the plan to accommodate the 24ft parking requirements. P. Amato recommended that the applicant work with staff to address the outstanding items in the staff memo.

P. Amato made a motion to grant approval of the application, pending staff recommendations and items discussed tonight, noting that if the applicant can't get the 24ft dimensions to work on the plan, they come back to the Board with a waiver request. T. Sloan seconded and all in favor.

J. Langdell commented that the Board should take a look at our parking regulations and a brief discussion on restaurant use calculations ensued.

#### **OLD BUSINESS:**

**Badger Hill Properties LLC – Timber Ridge Dr – Map 50, Lots 26-124, 26-126, 26-128, 26-129, 26-131, 26-133, 26-160, 26-162, 26-164, 26-166, 26-167, 26-168, 26-169, 26-171, 26-173, 26-175, 26-177, 26-179, 26-180, 26-181, 26-182, and 26-183; Map 51, Lots 26-47, 26-123, 26-125, 26-126, 26-127, 26-152, 26-170, 26-172, 26-174, 26-176, 26-178, and 26-184; Map 55, Lots 26-130, 26-132, 26-134 thru 26-151, 26-153 thru 26-159, 26-161, 26-163 and 26-165.**

Public Hearing for phase VI of Badger Hill for multiple lot line adjustments involving sixty (60) residential lots and three (3) open space lots; and to approve Phase VI-A for six (6) buildable lots in the Residence R District.

S. Robinson stepped up to the Board, as Paul Amato recused himself.

*Abutters present:*

*Brian & Christine Freitas, Woodhawk Dr*

*Harold & Tracie Sales, Badger Hill Dr*

*Jennifer Siegrist, Osgood Rd*

*Paul Amato, Spring Creek Sand & Gravel, Mason Rd*

*Dennis Vanzilen Jr., Badger Hill Dr*

Chairperson Langdell recognized:

Jon Lariviere, Badger Hill Properties, LLC

Scott Frankiewicz, Brown Engineering & Surveying, LLC

J. Langdell read the notice for the waiver request into the record. S. Wilson read the abutters into the record.

S. Frankiewicz distributed plans dated 7/15/14 and gave a brief overview of the application to date. He then detailed the individual plans.

**Lot line adjustment plan:**

Comments from the Conservation Commission memo dated 4/15/14 are reflected in the revisions to this plan. The open space has been reconfigured back to showing the 75 ft connection between both open space areas. The calculations are referenced on sheet 2. He also brought up lot 79 and said the biggest discussion right now is if it could be considered a buildable lot or if it would have to stay as access to open space.

J. Langdell asked if there was a plan showing the whole development to put that into perspective. S. Frankiewicz replied no. J. Langdell referenced the approved 2007 Master Plan and said this lot was deemed non-buildable in order to preserve it for potential access to an adjoining area of land owned by an abutter that had potential for development. J. Lariviere said that was correct but the one aspect that doesn't reflect is the contemplation of whether or not Timber Ridge Dr ever happened. At the time, that was the only potential location to allow for future abutter connections. As part of our new plan, we are providing two (2) alternate locations that make the most sense in the proximity of the property lines for a future possible connection. The theory being that we will trade those two new locations for the one at lot 79 with the caveat that lot 79 does not become buildable or until such time as Timber Ridge Dr is put in place and that those other access points are accessible. Lot 79 will be continually preserved now and wouldn't become available until the road frontage is completed in front of the other two proposed locations. J. Langdell said she recalled that there were two potential access points located at the end of Timber Ridge Dr and one at lot 79 are already on the approved plan, so we're not really trading anything. We also need to look at what these lots abut and the potential for useable connections. J. Lariviere said in his professional opinion, there is only one location that makes any sense for a possible future connection; the most likely connection, between lots 155 and 157, abuts tax map 50 lot 6. The others have extensive lengths of roadway to get to any property line without creating any value and the cost of building those roads are prohibitive for any developer.

S. Duncanson inquired if the number of lots will be changing and brought up 51/126-182. S. Frankiewicz said the proposed plan will still have the same number of lots with the exception that if lot 79 does not become buildable, we'd only be at 179 lots instead of 180 lots. If that were to occur, then at some future point we'd look to do a lot line consolidation to put that lot back in; it's simply the economics of it. Lot 182 was enlarged because the extensive slopes made the original lots unbuildable. The original plan didn't really consider the topography of the property. We are trying to do this in one large plan to look at the area more globally rather than building the road and adjusting small sections at a time. We are finding that the previous lot line revisions, done after the roads and utilities were in, now have telephone poles in the middle of properties and water service locations that do not line up with the appropriate lots. S. Duncanson asked if the Conservation Commission had seen this new plan. S. Frankiewicz said the plans have been revised based on their comments that he received yesterday, and will be forwarded to them for review. The fifty (50') ft connection between the open spaces has been restored.

Chairperson Langdell opened the meeting to the public for discussion pertaining to the proposed lot line adjustments.

T. Sales said she spoke at the last meeting about possibly putting in a ROW into the Brookline Town Forest. S. Frankiewicz explained the proposed twenty (20') ft wide private property easement and a brief discussion followed. J. Lariviere said we can possibly reconfigure those abutting lots to accommodate a deeded open space area. A. Fraizer said she was not familiar with that trailhead, but having open space would be preferable to an easement because it would allow us to maintain it and monitor any activity. Easements are very difficult for us. Thank you for revising the larger open space connection. Also, we would prefer lot 79 not become a building lot because it provides access from the open space to the road which leads to the Hitchiner Town Forest. This lot is more level and uses a minimum amount of roadway. S. Frankiewicz noted that there is another area near lot 181 that is not too steep and could be used or maybe something could be worked out for access from map 45 lot 11.

P. Amato said one of his issues is that we only have a piece of the plan and it's hard to tell what is being changed from what was approved prior. The proposed access points seem to be as far or further from Mile Slip Rd and at least the former access point came to the old jeep road on his property that used to go to Brookline. J. Lariviere

said both proximities are a long ways away but in planning for that, the access off Timber Ridge Dr goes to a property that has future development potential that could bring a road network within a few hundred feet of this proposed access. Lot 79 has at least a thousand ft connection to build and the length of that roadway would be cost prohibitive from a development standpoint. P. Amato said one cannot tell that from the information provided tonight and it continues to be a concern that we have a development with 180 houses with only one point of access. He would like to leave as much flexibility so that someday there will be another through way out or multiple ways out of there. It is a long way to Mile Slip and Young Roads and he doesn't foresee development along the Brookline border.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

J. Langdell read the comments from the staff memo dated 4/15/14. J. Lariviere stated that other than lot 79, there are only two lots remaining from the existing phase. They do have significant slope challenges which affect the salability, so no our intention is to start the new nine (9) lot phase before finishing the existing phase. There will be a lower tier pricing for those two lots that sit below the road, lots 78 and 80 that are on the inside slope of Badger Hill Dr. J. Levandowski verified that there are no conditions in the development regulations requiring phasing to be finished prior to starting the next. J. Lariviere said there is some construction material stockpiled behind lot 79 that will be used for the ongoing development, and added that they will clean up the minor amount of debris out there. We have submitted for the AoT permit and are working with the local environmental reviewer on the stormwater permitting process. The water system has been increased in size and is going on line now. In order to add onto the system we had to bring the existing system up to much higher standards before adding any new lots. The first 109 houses were on about 20,000 gallons of storage and we added 60,000 gallons which will be adequate storage for the remainder of the project. Pennichuck has given the go ahead for 51 more houses now with further review of actual usage numbers to determine if an additional source well will be needed to grant the last few houses. We used a standard of 675 gallons per day from peak usage and the original system was designed at 450 gallons per day with a 1.5 safety factor. J. Langdell noted that there is a contribution to the Town due at the 120<sup>th</sup> house.

J. Langdell inquired about the impact of the lot line adjustments to the overall open space percentage. S. Frankiewicz said it is down by half an acre, but we still have 64.5% of the overall phase area and then of that, there is 53.7% that are not wet or slopes. J. Levandowski stated that the overall open space requirement for the original project is 50%, there is no classification of useable area. She referenced Town Counsel comments stating....*not to exceed 180 lots and that the open space is at least 50% of the total area of the subdivision*, but will clarify with the original documents.

J. Langdell read the comments from Rick Riendeau, DPW Director, dated 7/15/14, that were in addition to the comments from 4/15/14. The contractor must follow the latest Town of Milford construction standards, inspections will be done by the Town's engineer, and that all bonds, permits and paperwork be properly be submitted to DPW prior to any construction. DPW has no issues with the extension request waiver.

J. Langdell also read the comments from the 7/15/14 staff memo. J. Levandowski added that Fred Elkind hasn't received enough information to fully review the stormwater plan because a lot has changed since the original approval, hence the recommendation to submit the information prior to Board approval. S. Frankiewicz said we haven't changed the drainage from the original plans; we're building the original approved drainage system. J. Levandowski said in discussions with the environmental coordinator, he is aware of that, and as long as the State approves it, that will be enough for our stormwater permit process. S. Frankiewicz said the only thing that should be outstanding is the SWPPP for the Notice of Intent.

**Dead-end road length waiver request:**

J. Lariviere explained that the total length of Timber Ridge Dr is approximately 5,000 ft. In practicality, to build 5,000 ft of road, development will be scattered throughout the area and the logistics of building it are a lot more difficult. Secondly, the maintenance costs of that roadway in today's market environment make it not the right way to approach this development. Our intent was to stay within ordinance asking for a 1,000ft road now and another 1,000 ft at the other end in the future and then connect the two segments. It turns out that the end of the 1,000 ft road falls on a slope and staff recommendation is the only reason we're extending it to 1,250 ft. We are

OK with building the extended length and it does make for a better drainage break and a better turn around spot at the crest of the hill. J. Langdell said it will ease some safety concerns, given the topography of the land and clarified this would be part of Phase VI-A. J. Lariviere said the extension of the road essentially makes eight (8) lots that will be on the roadway, but I don't think the number of lots is something we're really discussing today because it is part of the lot line adjustment plan for where the lots are going to be.

S. Duncanson inquired how much of Timber Ridge Dr has already been built. J. Lariviere said the first 250 ft of road is in, the water approximately 400 ft in and the first wetland crossing is in. S. Duncanson asked if the road and hammerhead would be paved. J. Lariviere replied yes. The road won't be continued after the hammerhead as a travel way, but there will be access for construction equipment.

Chairperson Langdell opened the meeting to the public for discussion pertaining to the roadway extension and waiver.

P. Amato said he didn't see this as any more of a dead-end road than the whole development. The sooner that loop gets done, the more people out there still trying to get in and out, so it's kind of a moot point. J. Lariviere explained that the plan is to come back for another 1,000 ft of road on the other side of Timber Ridge Dr and then complete the final 3,000 ft section of road. P. Amato noted that this Board probably hasn't had the chance to walk that area in a while and suggested a site walk prior to approval of this application. The entire loop is on a side hill. S. Robinson said she drove along part of that road the other day.

Chairperson Langdell closed the public portion of the meeting.

There was consensus among the Board members to do a site walk, which was scheduled for Saturday 8/2/14 at 9:00 am. Abutters, residents and the Conservation Commission are invited to attend and we shall meet at the intersection of Timber Ridge Dr and Badger Hill Dr. J. Lariviere said he will make sure the stations are marked.

T. Sloan agreed with Mr. Amato's concerns about tying this whole project together and requested plans with both the original and proposed access points. J. Langdell noted that staff may have layers in GIS that could help for the applicant.

T. Sloan made a motion to table the application to the 8/19/14 meeting. C. Beer seconded and all in favor.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15pm.

MINUTES OF THE JULY 15, 2014 PLANNING BOARD PUBLIC HEARING APPROVED AUG 19, 2014